

*McCarthy, Eugene*  
*Hugh Downs*  
*P. Goralski, Robert***RADIO-TV MONITORING SERVICE, INC.**

3408 WISCONSIN AVENUE, N. W.

--

WASHINGTON, D. C. 20016

--

244-8682

## PROGRAM:

THE TODAY SHOW

## DATE:

CIA 5-014  
May 20, 1966

## STATION OR NETWORK:

NBC-TV

## TIME:

7:00 A.M.

SENATOR EUGENE McCARTHY

HUGH DOWNS: The U. S. Senate is engaged in an inter-mural debate on extending its watch-dog control of the Central Intelligence Agency. The Foreign Relations Committee has voted to have its own members share in the control of the CIA. The move has been opposed by the Chairman of the Subcommittee now charged with that responsibility.

Leading the effort to broaden membership of the watch-dog committee is Democratic Senator Eugene McCarthy, of Minnesota. Senator McCarthy is in our Washington studio this morning, with NBC News correspondent Robert Goralski. Gentlemen?

ROBERT GORALSKI: Good morning, Senator. Senator, it seems to me this is more of a jurisdictional dispute. There is something deeper -- what is it -- why is the agitation at the present time for expanding the watch-dog role?

SENATOR McCARTHY: The Foreign Relations Committee, I think, is -- believes very strongly that the CIA role has greatly expanded over the last ten or twelve years, from being a simple kind of intelligence agency and information gathering agency, and an agency of limited operation, to a major force in the formulation of foreign policy. As you know, some of those who are opposed to expanding the supervisory committee say that the CIA does not make foreign policy.

Well none of us have really said that. Our difficulty has been, we've had to try to answer to charges which are attributed to us which we have not made -- but it does have a great influence in the development of foreign policy, and certainly does also does execute some foreign policy, under the direction of the President, under the direction of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense. I think this is irrelevant really. The basic question

- 2 -

is this, whether or not the Foreign Relations Committee -- which is the instrument of the Senate, in dealing with foreign policy, not just developing policy, but the execution of it -- should not be given the same kind of information about the operation of the Central Intelligence Agency that is now given to members of the Armed Services Committee and to the Appropriations Committee. We're not asking for any more information, or any different kind of information from what they're giving to the representatives of these two committees, to which the CIA now reports.

GORALSKI: Do you have any specific complaints against the CIA?

SEN. McCARTHY: Oh I think that there are a number of specific complaints -- these are really not so very important. Even though the CIA was operating perfectly, I would be of the opinion that we still ought to be exercising some supervision over it, as the foreign policy and foreign relations committee of the United States Senate. Some people have been properly disturbed over two or three things that indicate CIA activities -- not just overseas, but here in the United States itself, involving non-governmental institutions. The publicity given to the use of some of the university groups, in relation to CIA activities, either the instruments of the CIA or in some cases its cover for the CIA. This is an operating or a functional aspect which I think we ought to be concerned about, and then particularly the publication in the Foreign Affairs quarterly, of an article dealing with Viet Nam, but written by a member of the Intelligence Agency itself, who is not identified. You can't quite say it's propaganda -- he may be a very objective student or scholar, but no one really quite expects CIA members to be writing articles without being identified in journals for circulation in the United States.

GORALSKI: Well, Senator, it would seem that many of the people who oppose the role of the Foreign Relations Committee in supervising the CIA is a result of the fact that basically members of the Foreign Relations Committee tend to be more "dove-ish" in their approach.

SEN. McCARTHY: Well I don't know. There are some members of the Foreign Relations Committee who are "dove-ish." I think if you had a vote on any of the issues relating to Viet Nam, you'd probably have two or three to one vote in favor of the Administration's position in the Foreign Relations Committee. There are two or three members of the committee who are quite outspoken, but this is really a very small minority of the total committee.

But, Bob, this concern about the CIA, and your question about specific complaints is -- ought to be related to the fact that what we're recommending today was really proposed in a somewhat more severe and far-reaching form as long ago as 1955, by the Hoover Commission and their look at it was -- I suppose

- 3 -

you'd say somewhat detached and objective in terms of the manner in which our government ought to work. And they recommended very strongly in 1955 that a joint committee of the House and Senate be established, which would have the responsibility of supervising and giving direction to the Central Intelligence Agency. I think their case was a good one then, and it's a good one today. We're not seeking to go quite that far, but simply to expand the supervision so as to give the Foreign Relations Committee at least the same kind of information that's going to other committees.

GORALSKI: Senator, do you have any philosophical views of your own on whether this country, a democracy, should have a CIA? That type of organization?

SEN. McCARTHY: I think we have to have an intelligence agency of some kind. I have some reservations as to whether or not its activities ought to be as extensive as they are, and whether it ought to reach out and attempt to cover so many relatively unimportant -- what appear to be -- insignificant fields of operation. If this were a small country that had to live by its intelligence agency, it might be understandable. In any case I think the Foreign Relations Committee members, if they were included in the supervisory group, would be asking some hard questions about some of the things that we are quite sure are being done, raising questions as to whether they are advisable in terms of broad American policies and international objectives.

GORALSKI: Your statement on questions, Senator, the Foreign Relations Committee has had some very tough questions that have been posed to Secretary of Defense McNamara, Secretary of State Rusk, on Viet Nam. Do you anticipate the Foreign Relations Committee will expand its inquiry into Vietnamese policy at this point?

SEN. McCARTHY: Well I don't know as we will at this point. I expect that if things continue as they are, and if there's no clarification or no progress, or if there is some significant, might say, qualitative kind of change in our involvement, that the committee would at that point, again hold additional hearings with reference to Viet Nam. We have in any case, not foreclosed the possibility of additional hearings, but I would expect that we would probably not continue them unless there was some significant change or some new information develop which would make it possible for us to hold constructive hearings.

GORALSKI: What do you think of the situation there today, with the Buddhists and General Ky at odds again, and now it's getting to the point where people are being killed in large numbers.

SEN. McCARTHY: Well, it's so difficult to pass judgment,

- 4 -

one can really always sympathize with the Administration, the people who are responsible for immediate decisions. It seems to reflect rather strongly and indicate that some of the things that have been said about the situation in Viet Nam, not just in the last six months, but over the last year, the last year and a half said with a great deal of certainty by certain spokesmen, really did not have much substance. I think it just causes you to be concerned, and worried, and creates all kinds of doubts as to any very successful resolution of the problem in South Viet Nam.

GORALSKI: Where do you see that we're going, in Viet Nam, Senator? Do you see any possible hope?

SEN. McCARTHY: Well, I don't know that anyone -- I notice that the Secretary of State says that you really -- I don't know what the new phrase is -- whether you can't see the light at the end of the tunnel, or whether there's a new figure of speech. I think the immediate prospect is for an increase in the number of men that we have committed in Viet Nam, and for an intensification of the military effort.

GORALSKI: Do you agree with that policy, that prospect?

SEN. McCARTHY: I don't know whether I agree or disagree. I think this is -- my earlier position was that we ought to limit the number we commit. I think this is still -- this would have been better, say, let's hold on for a year, year and a half, without this great commitment, without an effort to accomplish victory by the commitment of a half million men and all kinds of munitions and supplies. If as so often said by those who are supposed to be experts in this, the North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong and the Chinese, believe that America will try to win a quick victory, whereas their position is that they can hold on year after year after year -- that what we're doing now is really trying to win a quick victory, which is, it would seem to me to be playing into at least their strategy.

If we had indicated -- look, we're going to be here, have 100,000 men, or 150,000 men -- I suppose the enclave idea, if you are allowed your own definition of an enclave, which they never allowed Gavin, you know, the critics immediately told you what he meant by an enclave -- didn't let him tell you what he meant -- that we would be a presence there, we were going to not allow them to take over, and if we'd been willing to make this kind of effort for a year or two, or indicate that we were there indefinitely, it would have been a better policy.

GORALSKI: Thank you very much, Senator Eugene McCarthy, of Minnesota -- now back to Hugh Downs, in New York.

DOWNES: Our thanks to Senator McCarthy, and Bob Goralski . . .